



July 26, 2021

VIA CM/ECF

Hon. Vernon S. Broderick, U.S.D.J.
Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse
40 Foley Square, Courtroom 518
New York, NY 10007

**Re: *In re Keurig Green Mountain Single-Serve Coffee Antitrust Litig.*,
MDL No. 2542**

Dear Hon. Judge Broderick:

I write on behalf of JBR regarding Keurig's letter motion to extend the time to file the opening briefs for Summary Judgment briefing (ECF No. 1426). JBR opposes Keurig's letter motion for multiple reasons. First, Keurig's decision to move for excess pages as late as it did in this litigation is the actual cause of the current situation. In other words, if Keurig desired excess pages, it could have moved for that relief months, if not years earlier, when previous scheduling orders were stipulated to. As discussed in a previous letter motion, the expansion of Keurig's Motion for Summary Judgment will saddle the Court with excessive briefing that serves no purpose other than to burden the parties and the Court and further delay a case that has already been pending for more than seven years.

Second, Keurig purports to justify its request by claiming that there are multiple parties but the underlying facts are the same. The reality is that Keurig wants to file a massive brief in hopes of delaying the trial date for years as this benefits Keurig and harms JBR. This latest request, which is little more than a demand that the Court speed up its ruling on the prior motion, must be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Daniel Johnson Jr.

Daniel Johnson Jr.

DAN JOHNSON LAW GROUP, LLP
dan@danjohnsonlawgroup.com
1350 Old Bayshore Highway, Suite 520
Burlingame, CA 94010
(415) 604-4500
Counsel for Plaintiff
JBR, Inc. d/b/a Rogers Family Company

Hon. Vernon S. Broderick, U.S.D.J.

July 26, 2021

Page **2** of **2**

cc: Counsel for All Parties (via ECF)